

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I



2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are not identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	School: CARROLL ROBBINS ELEMENTARY
Chief School Administrator: FRANCISCO DURAN	Address: 283 TYLER STREET TRENTON NJ
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: fduran@trenton.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K-5
Title I Contact:	Principal: BIENVENIDA GARDINET
Title I Contact E-mail:	Principal's E-mail: bgardinet@trenton.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number:	Principal's Phone Number: 609-957-7171

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

X I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ \$3,424,460, which comprised 98.9% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$ 3,333,465, which will comprise 98.7% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note:** A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

***Add lines as necessary.**

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
MARIA RODRIGUEZ	Resource Room	YES	YES	YES	
BRIAN L'OIASEU	School Counselor	YES	YES	YES	
KAREN DELGADO	3 rd grade teacher	YES	YES	YES	
SANDRA ESTRADA	2 nd grade Bilingual teacher	YES	YES	YES	
JENNIFER AYLING	2 nd grade teacher	YES	YES	YES	
JESSICA BERNSTEIN	Intervention teacher	YES	YES	YES	
BIENVENIDA GARDINET	Principal	YES	YES	YES	
MARY GUARIN	Vice Principal	YES	YES	YES	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
MAY 28, 2015	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		x	
JUNE 2, 2015 June 10, 2015	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		x	
JUNE 5, 2015	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Program Evaluation (SIP ONLY)	X		x	
June 15, 2015	Robbins Annex	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	

****Add rows as necessary.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	
--	--

Carroll Robbins Elementary School in partnership with our children, families, staff and community seeks the best education through daily rigorous, engaging and differentiated learning experiences. All stakeholders will be accountable and motivated to attain this vision through a nurturing, safe and respectful environment.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). *A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.*

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program * (For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?
2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?
3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?
4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?
5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?
6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?
7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?
8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?
9. How did the school structure the interventions?
10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?
11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?
12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

****Provide a separate response for each question. Note: The school was a focus school during the school year 2014-2015. These questions do not apply.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4			2014-2015 Data is unavailable	The school did not have 4 th grade in 2013-2014
Grade 5				
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4			2014-2015 Data is unavailable	The school did not have 4 th grade in 2013-2014
Grade 5				
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance *Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)*

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 -2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten				
Kindergarten	11 students	14 students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexia Literacy centers, anecdotal notes (guided reading) after school intervention (RTI) 	<p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that 65 % of the students in grade K were reading on or above grade level.</p> <p>Data from the fourth ELA District Benchmark indicated that 81% of the students were proficient.</p> <p>Lack of technology, staff medical leave, I&RS referrals and CST referrals</p>
Grade 1	28 students	31students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexia Literacy Centers anecdotal notes (guided reading) after school intervention 	<p>Lack of technology, staff medical leave, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, limited staffing resources due to new building opening, transferred/newcomer students lacking reading/writing foundational skills, lacking of effective instruction.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that 53 % of the students were reading on or above grade level.</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark indicated that 79 % of the students were proficient.</p>
Grade 2	16 students	23 students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexia, Literacy Centers, anecdotal notes(during guided 	<p>Number of students with interrupted formal education (bilingual students/newcomers), lack of extended day program to provide intervention</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

			reading) • ESL after School program, • Lexia after School program	Data from the DRA scores indicated that 61 % of the students were reading on or above grade level. Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark indicated that 45% of the students were proficient.
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten				
Kindergarten	N/A	5	Math centers, small group instruction	Lack of technology, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, transferred/newcomer students lacking math foundational skills , lacking of effective instruction Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark indicated that 82% of the students were proficient.
Grade 1	N/A	7	Math centers, small group instruction	Lack of technology, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, transferred/newcomer students lacking math foundational skills , lacking of effective instruction Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark indicated that 95% of the students were proficient.
Grade 2	N/A	16	Math centers, small group instruction	Lack of technology, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, transferred/newcomer students lacking math foundational skills , lacking of effective instruction Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark indicated that 82% of the students were proficient.
Grade 9				

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Grade 10				
----------	--	--	--	--

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Room • System 44 • Lexia 	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA Scores • Irla Results • System 44 Progress reports • Lexia Reports • Connect • NJASK • Access Assessments 	<p>SRI reports indicated a growth of 166 points in Lexile for the resource room students.</p> <p>SPI reports showed 3 students at the beginning decoding status, 6 students at the developing stage and 1 at the advance level in the resource room.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data (February) from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were: General Ed.</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient.</p> <p>K- 81% 1st- 79% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 18% 4th- 7 %</p>
Math	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Rom • Cool Math 	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificates • ED connect Reports • District Benchmarks • NJASK 	<p>Data form the SMI indicated a growth of 166 points in quantile.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					K- 82 % 1 st - 95% 2 nd - 45 % 3 rd - 41% 4 th - 9%
ELA	Homeless	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math	Homeless		n/a	n/a	n/a
ELA	Migrant	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Math	Migrant	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexia, Read 180, Small group instruction Intervention Teacher Technology Programs ex.story bird 	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dra Scores, Irla Results System 44 Progress Reports Lexia Reports Connect NJASK Access Assessments 	<p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53%</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<p>2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the LLLs students' proficient.</p> <p>K- 58 % 1st- 87% 2nd- 32% 3rd- 6 % 4th- 9 %</p>
Math	ELLs	Cool Math	Yes	Growth Reports, Connect	<p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated proficiency level of ELLs students.</p> <p>K- 77% 1st- 91% 2nd- 45% 3rd- 13% 4th- 9%</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 ,indicated for ELLs students 32% were proficient, and 47 % Advance Proficient.</p>
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexia, • Read 180 • System 44, • Small group • Intervention Teacher 	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRa scores, independent and instructional levels 	<p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 ,indicated for Economically Disadvantage students 35% were proficient, and 28 % Advance Proficient</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient.</p> <p>K- 81% 1st- 79% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 18% 4th- 9 %</p> <p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in LA 3rd grade. Students didn't meet the target of 51.8 %.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aleks, (3rd,4th), • Math Centers • Cool Math 	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth Reports • Connect • ED connect Reports • District Benchmarks • NJASK 	<p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in Math. Students met the target of 62.5%.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p> <p>K- 82 % 1st- 95% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 41% 4th- 9%</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA					
Math					

Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A Resource Room ESY(Extended School Year)	N/A	N/A	<p>Students cannot participate in any before or after school program due to transportation EYS Data Unavailable.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated a growth of 166 points in lexile for the resource room students.</p> <p>SPI reports showed 3 students at the beginning decoding status, 6 students at the developing stage and 1 at the advance level.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A ESY(Extended School Year)	N/A	N/A	Students cannot participate in any before or after school program due to transportation EYS Data Unavailable. Data form the SMI indicated a growth of 166 points in quantile.
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	ESL Afterschool Program, Before School Read 180, PARCC afterschool Program, Lexia computer program	Yes	Pre and post tests, growth reports	Lexiles , test scores and DRA levels , benchmark scores
Math	ELLs	PARCC afterschool Program	YES	Pre and post tests	Quantiles, test scores and DRA levels , benchmark scores
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	ESL Afterschool Program, Before School Read 180, PARCC afterschool Program, Lexia computer program	YES	Pre and post tests, growth reports Read 180	SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					<p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the LLLs students' proficient.</p> <p>K- 58 % 1st- 87% 2nd- 32% 3rd- 6 % 4th- 9 %</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PARCC afterschool Program	YES	Pre and post assessments	<p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p> <p>K- 82 % 1st- 95% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 41% 4th- 9%</p>
ELA					
Math					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep LA 3-4 • Data Protocol Analysis k-4 • Guided Reading K-1 • Literacy Centers K-1 • DRA/ENIL Analysis K-1 • ED Connect • Grade Book 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA • District Benchmarks • NJASK (Science) • PARCC Tests Results • SPI And SRI Test Tests 	<p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth ELA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the ELLs students' proficient.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					K- 58 % 1 st - 87% 2 nd - 32% 3 rd - 6 % 4 th - 9 %
Math	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Math 3-4 • Standards Solutions Test Prep 3-4 • Math Centers • ED connect 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA • District Benchmarks • PARCC Tests Results • SMI Test Results 	<p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students. (General Education Students). Data for special ed. Is not available.</p> K- 82 % 1 st - 95% 2 nd - 45 % 3 rd - 41% 4 th - 9%

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Homeless		yes		
Math	Homeless		yes		
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep LA 3-4 • Data Protocol Analysis k-4 • Guided Reading K-1 • Literacy Centers K-1 • DRA/ENIL Analysis K-1 • ED Connect • Grade Book 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA • District Benchmarks • NJASK (Science) • PARCC Tests Results • SPI And SRI Test Tests 	<p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , _____ students reading advanced, _____ proficient, _____ basic and _____ below basic. Will add data</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>K- 58 % 1st- 87% 2nd- 32% 3rd- 6 % 4th- 9 %</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PARCC Test Prep LA 3-4 Data Protocol Analysis k-4 Guided Reading K-1 Literacy Centers K-1 DRA/ENIL Analysis K-1 ED Connect Grade Book 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRA District Benchmarks NJASK (Science) PARCC Tests Results SPI And SRI Test Tests 	<p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , _____ advanced, _____ proficient, _____ basic and _____ below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students. (General Education Students). Data for special ed. Is not available.</p> <p>K- 77% 1st- 91% 2nd- 45% 3rd- 13% 4th- 9%</p>
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PARCC Test Prep LA 3-4 Data Protocol Analysis k-4 Guided Reading K-1 Literacy Centers K-1 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRA District Benchmarks NJASK (Science) PARCC Tests Results SPI And SRI Test Tests 	<p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRA/ENIL Analysis K-1 ED Connect Grade Book 			<p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the LLLs students' proficient.</p> <p>K- 58 % 1st- 87% 2nd- 32% 3rd- 6 % 4th- 9 %</p>
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PARCC Test Prep LA 3-4 Data Protocol 	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRA District Benchmarks NJASK (Science) 	<p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Analysis k-4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Reading K-1 • Literacy Centers K-1 • DRA/ENIL Analysis K-1 • ED Connect • Grade Book 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Tests Results • SPI And SRI Test Tests 	<p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p> <p>K- 82 % 1st- 95% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 41% 4th- 9%</p>
ELA					
Math					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Back to School Night, Data Presentation-(NJASK/Attendance), Walking In Your Child Foot Steps, Climate and Culture Surveys, Parent University, Literacy Night, Common Core Workshop For Parents, Health Fair, My Dad MY Hero, Community Resources Workshop, Parent Tutoring, Grandpa's Day, Coffee With Principal Muffins For Moms, Understanding Child Development, Survey of Needed Programs ,Fruit And Vegetables, Robbins-Excellence In Education, Carrer day, Skin Cancer, Parents Anonyms, Junior Achievement, Young Audiences,	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sig In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	Data indicates that 35% attended the activities for the year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Mentors College Of New jersey, NJ Cares, Mercer Council, Book Fisrt,Stroke Prevention, Mecha, Bike Safety		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	
Math	Students with Disabilities		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	Data indicates that __35%_ attended the activities for the year.
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sig In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	Data indicates that __35%_ attended the activities for the year.
Math	ELLs			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sig In Sheets 	Data indicates that __35%_ attended the

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Evaluation 	activities for the year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sig In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	Data indicates that __35%_ attended the activities for the year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sig In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation 	Data indicates that __35%_ attended the activities for the year.
ELA					
Math					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

X ☐ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

Bienvenida Gardinet
Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Data Collection and Analysis*

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA scores • District Benchmarks • NJASK (Science) • PARCC results • SRI and SPI Results • Report Cards • Assessments Connect 	<p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 ,indicated for Economically Disadvantage students 35% were proficient, and 28 % Advance Proficient.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 3rd grade , 3 students reading advanced, 15 proficient, 25 basic and 23 below basic.</p> <p>SRI reports indicated in 4th grade , 1 student reading advanced, 13 proficient, 17 basic and 19 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were:</p> <p>k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<p>K- 81%</p> <p>1st- 79%</p> <p>2nd- 45 %</p> <p>3rd- 18%</p> <p>4th- 9 %</p> <p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in LA 3rd grade.</p> <p>Students didn't meet the target of 51.8 %.</p> <p>PARCC scores pending</p>
Academic Achievement - Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Results 	Pending PARCC scores
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Benchmarks • PARCC results • SMI Results • Report Cards • Assessments Connect 	<p>NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in Math.</p> <p>Students met the target of 62.5%.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 3rd grade , No students advanced, 0 proficient, 10 basic and 64 below basic.</p> <p>SMI reports indicated in 4th grade , 0 students advanced, 5 proficient, 3 basic and 43 below basic.</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		K- 82 % 1 st - 95% 2 nd - 45 % 3 rd - 41% 4 th - 9% Pending PARCC scores
Family and Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection Of Surveys • Sign In -Sheets 	The Data of the sign in Sheets indicated that _35%__participated in school events for the year.
Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA scores • District Benchmarks • PARCC Results • NJASK (science) • Report Cards 	Data from the DRA scores (February) indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were: k- 65% 1 st -53% 2 nd -61% 3 rd -13% 4 th -13%
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent, Staff , and Students Surveys 	The parent Surveys indicated the following approval rating: Physical Enviroment-75% Emotional Enviroment-73% Learning-76% Relationships- 77% Community Engagement- 80% Morale In School- 72%

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
School Climate and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parent, Staff , and Students Surveys 	The parent Surveys indicated the following approval rating: Physical Enviroment-75% Emotional Enviroment-73% Learning-76% Relationships- 77% Community Engagement- 80% Morale In School- 72%
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	
Students with Disabilities		The climate and culture is anonymous. It cannot be desegregated.
Homeless Students	N/A	
Migrant Students	N/A	
English Language Learners		The climate and culture is anonymous. It cannot be desegregated.
Economically Disadvantaged		The parent Surveys indicated the following approval rating: Physical Enviroment-75% Emotional Enviroment-73% Learning-76% Relationships- 77% Community Engagement- 80% Morale In School- 72%

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

Teachers at each grade GLM performed an analysis of the DRA and Benchmark Tests. Strategies, interventions and Professional development were identified.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

Data from NJASK, DRA, SMI, SPI, SRI and District Benchmarks were used to identify each subgroup.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)? The Data collected was a result of multiple measurements; it was aligned to identify the areas of needs and strengths.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

Data indicated that there is a need of professional development and students interventions in the areas of reading and Math.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

The Data indicated that there is a need of professional development in the areas of Reading and Math.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

Students at risk are identified at the beginning of the school year by the I&RS team and teachers.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

After the students are identified at the beginning of the school students are assigned to the Intervention Teacher and IRS team of the school.

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students?

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

N/A

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students?

N/A

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Teachers meet weekly on their Grade Level to analyze Data and discuss the appropriate assessments to use. They guide instruction and practices after analyzing the Data.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

Parents receive an informative letter on a timely matter, student in pre k shadowed the new the school at the end of the school year.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

The priority problems and root causes were identified based on the data from the NJASK, DRA, SMI, SRI, SPI, ACCESS, District Benchmarks Test and school surveys.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them*

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Use student achievement data in an ongoing basis to guide instruction and plan for intervention	The school needs to adopt a RTI model in every classroom for ELA instruction.
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>DRA (Percentage of students reading on level as of February 2015. k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Benchmarks Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students. K- 82 % 1st- 95% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 41% 4th- 9%</p> <p>Data from the fourth ELA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient.</p> <p>K- 81% 1st- 79%</p>	<p>DRA (Percentage of students reading on level as of February 2015. k- 65% 1st-53% 2nd-61% 3rd-13% 4th-13%</p> <p>Benchmarks Data from the fourth ELA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient.</p> <p>K- 81% 1st- 79% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 18% 4th- 7 %</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

	<p>2nd- 45 %</p> <p>3rd - 18%</p> <p>4th - 7 %</p>	
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>2-4 grade students have not been exposed to the CCSS.</p> <p>Teachers still need training and time to use the Data Protocol.</p> <p>This area was identified in our QSR</p>	The master schedule did not allow the time for an intervention period in every classroom
Subgroups or populations addressed	Economically Disadvantage and ELLs	Economically Disadvantage and ELLs
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)		
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	<p>Teachers will get training on how to analyze the DRA in order to identify students' weaknesses and strengths</p> <p>Teachers will continue getting training on the district approved Data Protocol</p> <p>A data team will be created to monitor student progress.</p>	<p>All teachers will get training on the RTI model (Ongoing)</p> <p>Intervention period will be built in the master schedule 20</p> <p>Teachers will identify Tier 1,2,3 students</p> <p>Early identification of students will happen by Oct. 2015</p> <p>The intervention teacher will provide additional support to students that are struggling in reading,</p> <p>A data team will be created to monitor student progress.</p>
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	By using the data protocol, the teachers will use identify the CCSS students are not mastering. They will identify interventions to drive instruction standards.	The teacher will be teaching skills aligned to the CCSS but at the student instructional level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)*

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Data from benchmarks shows a decline in math	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>Benchmarks</p> <p>Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students.</p> <p>K- 82 %</p> <p>1st- 95%</p> <p>2nd- 45 %</p> <p>3rd- 41%</p> <p>4th- 9%</p> <p>NJASK 3 only (2013) 62.5 Proficiency</p>	
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>3-4 grade students have not been exposed to the CCSS.</p> <p>Teachers still need training and time to use the Data Protocol.</p> <p>This area was identified in our QSR</p>	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELLs and Economically disadvantage	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)		
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Teachers will get training in Math Reasoning, creating rigorous math centers, number sense, Number Talk, higher order thinking questions	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Lesson plans will be aligned to the district curriculum	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . “

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource Room System 44 Lexia 	Resource Room Teachers	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC DRA levels.	Guided Reading RTI in the classroom
Math	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource Room Cool Math 	Resource Room Teachers	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC Benchmarks scores	Number Talks Higher order thinking questions Math centers aligned to the CCSS Use off technology
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	•			
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lexia Program Read 180 Small group instruction Intervention Teacher RTI in the classroom Data protocol 	Teachers, Intervention teacher, ESL teachers, Literacy Leader	Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs	Guided reading Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology Programs ex. story bird • Close reading strategy 			
Math	ELLs	Flex Math CCSS training for teachers Data Protocol	Literacy Leader, Principal, teachers	Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexia Program • Read 180 • Small group instruction • Intervention Teacher • RTI in the classroom • Data protocol Analysis • Technology Programs ex. story bird • Close reading strategy 		Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs, intervention teacher data	Guided reading Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Flex Math CCSS training for teachers	Literacy Leader, Principal	Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy
ELA					
Math					

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year</u> and <u>before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A ESY(Extended School Year)	N/A	N/A	
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A ESY(Extended School Year)	N/A	N/A	
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	ESL Afterschool Program, after school intervention (pending funding)	ESL contact teacher, Principal, teachers, Literacy Leader, Paras	Pre and post tests, growth reports	DRA levels , benchmark scores
Math	ELLs	PARCC afterschool Program (pending funding)	Principals, Literacy Leader, Teachers	Pre and post tests	benchmark scores
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	ESL Afterschool Program, after school intervention (pending funding)	ESL contact teacher, Principal, teachers, Literacy Leader, Paras	Pre and post tests, growth reports	DRA levels , benchmark scores
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PARCC afterschool Program (pending funding)	Principals, Literacy Leader, Teachers	Pre and post tests	benchmark scores
ELA					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math					

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Reading/ELA Best Practices to Teach Writing Brain learning Strategies Use of writing rubrics/creating rubrics 	Principal Vice principal Presenters Literacy Coach Teacher Teachers	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Guided reading Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network
Math	Students with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number sense 	Principal		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	Disabilities	Principal K-5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning in Math k-5 	Vice principal Presenters Math Coach Teacher Teachers	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Reading/LA (Best Strategies to teach) k-5 	Principal Vice principal	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Guided reading Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing Best strategiesk-5 Brain learning Parent University k-5 Dual Language BL/Coaching-K Team teaching- k Learning centers 	<p>Presenters</p> <p>Literacy Coach Teacher</p> <p>Teachers</p>		
Math	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number sense Principal K-5 Reasoning in Math k-5 Learning Centers Number Talks 	<p>Principal</p> <p>Vice principal</p> <p>Presenters</p> <p>Math Coach Teacher</p>	<p>Workshop evaluations</p> <p>Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs</p>	<p>Danielson rubric</p> <p>Math Talks</p> <p>Bloom's Taxonomy</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Teachers Consultants		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Reading/LA (Best Strategies to teach) k-5 Writing Best strategies k-5 Brain learning Parent University k-5 Dual Language BL/Coaching-K Team teaching- k Learning centers 	Principal Vice principal Presenters Literacy Coach Teacher Teachers	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Guided reading Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> number sense Principal K-5 Reasoning in Math k-5 	Principal Vice principal	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a) (4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning Centers 	Presenters Math Coach Teacher Teachers		
ELA					
Math					

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?
Parents surveys, .SLT team, Literacy Leader
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?
Available funds and having two buildings
3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)? Meeting with the staff and parents at the beginning of the year to set expectations.
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? Monkey Surveys
5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? Climate and Culture survey, school surveys
6. How will the school structure interventions? Time will be built into the master schedule.
7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?
Five times a week for an instructional period.
8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?
IPads, laptops s desktops, etc... (We need more!!!), RTI Network
9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? DRA Data Wall, RTI data, Intervention teacher data, Lexia, Read 180 progress report.
10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? The school will create a data team that will monitor the student data and progress.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

ESEA §1114 (b) (1) (F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children does well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development 	Principal / Vice Principal Counselor Teachers Presenters Agencies	Increase Of NJASK and PARCC test by 10% DRA level growth of at least 1 year	
Math	Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development 	Principal / Vice Principal Counselor Teachers Presenters Agencies	Increase Of NJASK and Parc test by 10%	
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents 		<p>Increase Of NJASK and Parcc tests by 10%</p> <p>DRA level growth of at least 1 year</p>	
Math	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents 		<p>Increase Of NJASK and Parcc tests by 10%</p>	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents 			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARCC Test Prep Workshop 			

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy Night Parent University Understanding Your Child Development CCSS Workshop for Parents 			
ELA					
Math					

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

Activities, workshops and programs will be offered to parents on a monthly basis.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

The leadership will solicit Parents to involve in the development of the plan.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

During Back to school night and via mail, school messenger

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

The leadership will solicit Parents to involve in the development of the plan.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

The document will be reviewed during Back to school night and will be mailed to parents.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

Parents will received updates via mail and workshops, PTC,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?

Parents will receive a letter indicating the district performance and student performance.

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

9. Parents will received updates via mailed and workshops, PTC, .

10. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I School wide Plan?

Parents of the SLT and PTO will be part of the Data review.

11. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

Parents will receive interim reports every six weeks and marking period reports cards. They will be informed via school messenger and have access on line to student's grades (If available). ESL teachers and intervention teacher will create a progress report every six weeks. The report will be sent home to the families.

12. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

They will be used on parent workshops and programs to improve students' achievement.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

ESEA §1114(b) (1) (E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	38	
	100	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	5	
	100	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*		

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible